

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
COMP PLAN UPDATE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2003**

City Hall Council Chambers  
210 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the City Hall Council Chambers, 210 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Vancouver, Washington.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, Carey Smith; Jada Rupley, and Vaughn Lein, Chair.

Members Absent: Ron Barca and Jeff Wriston.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; Derek Chisholm, Planner II; Jeroen Kok & Steve Duh, Vancouver Parks; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

**GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for October 23, 2003**

The agenda for October 23, 2003, was approved as distributed.

**B. Communications from the Public**

None.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

### **A. UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

**PLEASE NOTE: This hearing will focus on testimony from property owners on requested changes in land use designations and then focus on Comp Plan Text and Code Revisions.**

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

- Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.
- Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.
- Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.
- A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

**Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.**

LEIN: We will continue on with the update of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. Tonight we will be concentrating on the capital facilities plan and anyone wishing to make testimony on other issues after we are done with the capital facilities plan, we will open that up later this evening if we have time. So with that, Mr. Lee.

LEE: I'm going to have Evan give the staff report and I believe Jeroen Kok and Steve Duh of the Vancouver Clark Parks will also be participating in the presentation.

DUST: For the record, Evan Dust, Program Manager II for Transportation and Long-Range Planning, Clark County. You have before you a staff report regarding capital facilities plan and element of our comprehensive plan. It outlines for you requirements in State law for the capital facilities element. Our County capital facilities plan includes Chapter 6 of the comprehensive plan, the capital facilities element, the

County's capital facilities financial plan which fulfills the six year financially constrained capital facilities document required by GMA, the transportation capital facilities plan which is a 20-year document. Included by reference are the Clark Public Utilities water system plan, the Hazel Dell Sewer District comprehensive general sewer plan, the capital facilities plans of the City of Vancouver for water and sewer, the school district capital facilities plans and Chapter 7 of the comprehensive plan which is the parks, rec and open space element.

The Chapter 6 the capital facilities element and the County's capital facilities financial plan have been transmitted to you under separate cover, they are updated to match the proposed plan. The transportation capital facilities plan, which is a 20-year document, has posed staff some significant challenges. From the revenue perspective document which was transmitted separately, we note that there is approximately \$536 million worth of revenue available for capital projects and continuing capital programs over the 20 year life of the land use plan. Totaling up the capital facilities that would be indicated by the demand on the transportation network we would end up with \$673.5 million worth of expenditure.

Historically the County since the year 2000 has taken a financially constrained approach to the 20 year capital facilities plan. That approach is clearly beyond what is required in State law. In this particular land use plan that financial constraint applied at a 20 year level produces several significant challenges for the County. The figure which is actually Figure 10 from the Final Environmental Impact Statement which was reproduced in the staff report shows that after we've made investments on the County system in the order of \$536 million we still have significant corridors experiencing poor level-of-service measured at a regional model scale. In particular outlined in the staff report the expansion of the Battle Ground urban growth area seems to place significant north/south demands on the rural transportation system in excess of the ability of the County to meet those demands. The analysis of our capital facilities plan for transportation doesn't handle the expanded urban growth areas where historically by County policy urban development requires annexation. And the expansion area north of the fairgrounds in the vicinity of the 179th interchange places significant demands on the Interstate 5 corridor. Those demands are in excess of planned State improvements over the 20-year period as indicated in the metropolitan transportation plan and there are no good County alternatives to meeting that demand.

Recognizing that this is a 20-year forecast of demand and a 20-year estimation of revenue emphasizing that State law requires at least a 10-year forecast of demand and a multi-year financial plan that provides for projects that is in excess of six years in duration, how to handle the shortfall staff has outlined three options to approach, approaching this issue. One is a status quo. It's what we did with the financially constrained 20 year capital facilities plan or the affordable capital facilities plan in the year 2000. We essentially chased those red lines on the map until we ran out of money and then all the red lines that were left after we ran out of money we lowered the

level-of-service so that effectively the red lines went away. They only go away by definition only. The congestion is still there, we're just stating that we can't afford to meet that level of congestion. Another alternative is to focus on the rural facilities on the County system that show up as under stress by this proposed land use plan and lower the level-of-service on those facilities diverting that money to other corridors within urban areas.

The third option is to take a radically different approach to capital facilities planning and go across the board and lower the level-of-service regardless of the location of the corridor. This would allow there to be more money in effect left over from the \$536 million of expected revenue which could be targeted to strategically improve level-of-service possibly beyond the development standards set in the concurrency ordinance to make certain employment centers attractive. This approach would be consistent with the concept of focus public investment.

Regardless of these approaches we still don't have a solution on the State highway system. Clearly the State highway system is very important in this region. This land use plan imposes a great deal of demand on that State highway system and we have no control to change either the level-of-service on the State highway system, particularly highways of statewide significance, or to enact improvements on that system. As a result of the transportation analysis primarily staff will be making a request to you to consider placing urban holding on expansion areas proposed in this plan. That will give us time to try to enact whatever recommendation comes out of addressing the transportation capital facilities issues. It will also give time for other capital facilities providers to catch up.

In that light, looking at water and sewer in dealing with the providers of the water and sewer systems that serve urban areas none of their plans fully recognize the proposed UGA expansions so they will be following on with additional capital facilities work to determine how they would serve these areas. The same issue applies to the school districts whose capital facilities plans may not fully account for the additional population being placed in each of the districts. As Pat noted in his introduction, we have staff here from Vancouver Clark Parks to address a proposed amendment to their program and at this time I will call them to continue the staff presentation.

KOK: Thank you, Evan. Good evening. My name is Jeroen Kok, I'm a Senior Planner with the Vancouver Clark Parks Recreation Department and I'm joined this evening by Steve Duh, who's also a Senior Planner with the Department, and we thank you for this opportunity to briefly go over the proposed update to both the urban and regional capital facilities plans that we have in place. This evening we're asking you to consider recommending to the Board of Commissioners adoption of that, those draft updates. Just by way of clarification, we have two comprehensive plans that guide our efforts. The one plan for the urban area, which includes not only the city of Vancouver but all of the Vancouver urban growth area is the 2002 May adoption of the urban parks,

recreation and open space plan, and then out in the rural area we have a plan that was adopted in June of 2000 and it's our regional parks, recreation and open space plan.

Obviously the urban plan deals with items such as acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks, urban open spaces, sports fields and trail corridors within the urban system. The regional plan focuses on regional trails, regionally significant greenways and open spaces, regional trail system and also special recreation facilities of a regional significance. The CFP updates are part of our annual process to update those plans and essentially the updates cover updated project costs and timing, as well as adding any new projects that we anticipate for the coming year.

The proposed update to the CFP is limited only to the CFP items, so we're not proposing any updates to our goals, policies or standards within the plans at this time. This update, as Evan mentioned before with some of the other CFP updates, does not contemplate any of the proposed comprehensive plan changes that you're considering at this time, we would address those changes in next year's annual update after the decisions have been made by the -- finally by the Board of Commissioners. If you'd like I can go into some detail about the specifics of the plan. I'll leave that up to you whether or not you want to spend any time doing that this evening.

LEIN: Do you want to hear some? Please.

KOK: Some of the details that are incorporated in the plan include PIF or Park Impact Fee spending at a rate that avoids any expiration of the PIF dollars. Essentially you have two components, there's an acquisition and a development component. Each of those has a six-year timeline and this plan anticipates spending those dollars before they hit that six-year expiration date. Another important project in the plan, and this was added last year, is \$5.5 million of real estate excise tax that would be utilized to improve sports fields throughout the urban unincorporated area primarily in partnership with school districts as well as youth sports groups in the urban area. The plan also contemplates continued acquisition of both neighborhood and community park property as well as urban open space to meet our urban adopted levels of service. That plan also contemplates some special facilities primarily in the urban area with off-leash dog area, a disc golf course and extending into primarily the rural area some projects that would incorporate environmental education and interpretation facilities into our regional ownership.

The plan also contains a continued aggressive program of acquiring land for and developing a regional trail system that courses throughout the county. The plan also incorporates planning and restoration projects on a system-wide basis throughout some of our significant County owned greenway ownership and primarily the East Fork as well as Salmon Creek and Burnt Bridge Creek. The plan also contemplates continued program of capital repairs and maintenance activities to keep our existing facilities in good shape. It should be noted that the plan does rely significantly on grants, partners,

donations and other sources of funding to help us to provide this level-of-service to the folks here in Clark County.

Some of the important new regional projects that we are proposing to add to the plan include a master plan and a maintenance plan for the County owned lands within the East Fork of the Lewis River Greenway. There is a Burnt Bridge Creek Trail renovation project so the existing segment of the Burnt Bridge Creek Trail that runs from I-5 on the east to Fruit Valley Road on the west would go through a rehabilitation process. We have in this past year acquired through the trust land transfer process a piece of property from the Washington Department of Natural Resources. It's out toward Camas, it's the Green Mountain property, and we're proposing to develop a management plan for 360 acres of what is now currently forested land with no improvements on it. We are also proposing to enter into a master planning process for 112 acres of property that we purchased on the East Fork of the Lewis River immediately downstream of Daybreak Park on the south side of the river. It's an important area not only for recreation and open space purposes, but also fish and wildlife habitat. And, finally, the plan from the regional perspective also contemplates an update to the regional trail and bikeway master plan. Steve, do you want to give a couple of highlights on the urban system?

DUH: Sure. On the urban system the plan that you see before you tonight includes only a handful of new projects and those include the development of a neighborhood park in the unincorporated area called Greyhawk. It would be a partnership project with the homeowner's association that lives adjacent to the park and it would provide development of that site in about two years. Additionally there's further acquisition of park land in the unincorporated urban area and specifically the expansion of the newly constructed Felida community park. And those are really just some of the highlights from the urban system that are new to the list.

KOK: So again in summary, we're asking for the Planning Commission to recommend to the Board of Commissioners adoption of the proposed CFP. And if this is the appropriate time we're available to answer any questions you might have.

LEIN: Any questions of Jeroen or Steve at this point? Jada.

RUPLEY: Tell me a little bit real briefly about the Greyhawk partnership with the homeowner's association.

DUH: Certainly. Let me preface that story a little bit with some history. When the County adopted the park impact fee development component of the park impact fee in '96, it was the understanding that the City of Vancouver would annex areas or areas within the unincorporated area would become incorporated through some process and those park development fees would be spent at that time on park development. Part of that is the understanding that the County generally provides regional services and

neighborhood parks are considered an urban service left to a City. So the County has been banking the park development, the park impact fee development money and we are now at a point where in some districts the need to spend those dollars is upon us and the homeowners around this one particular park on NE 50th Ave approached us about a year ago with interest in developing their park site.

They understand that resources are available for park development through park impact fees, but the County doesn't have the resources to maintain the site once it were developed. So the partnership that we're looking at at this point is that the homeowner's association take some sort of ownership of the park by means of helping to finance the maintenance of this site if we commit to developing that in a timeline that's more rapid than what would be if the County waited until annexation or incorporation happened. So there is no formal agreement at this point, we're still entering, we're still in negotiations with the neighborhood association, but the intent is that their neighborhood park would be developed sooner, probably next year or the year after, and that they would finance maintenance until that time when either annexation happens, incorporation happens or potentially a special park district is formed that covers the issues of maintenance that revolve around park development.

RUPLEY: Is this the first time you've done this kind of partnership with a homeowner's association?

DUH: This is.

RUPLEY: Okay. And then with that, that doesn't mean they're going to do the maintenance themselves, they're going to look at some assessment and then does the parks then, are you responsible for the maintenance with their fees?

DUH: It would, yeah. Yes. It would likely be that the County maintains the property through the County's Operations Department and then, yeah, the homeowners are self-assessing themselves and the tax to pay for that.

RUPLEY: All right. I'm kind of excited to hear more about that, I think that's a very novel approach in terms of rather than waiting forever.

SMITH: How do they determine that? Is it a majority of the homeowners within the association or they have to have all of them agree?

DUH: Honestly I would have to look at their bylaws, I don't recall.

RUPLEY: When you're gone on a trip, they put your name down.

LEIN: Well, Jeroen, I had a question. With the information that's been passed out when we look at the 20-year plan for 2003-2008 there's a table in here for the real

estate excise tax that would go to parks in the amount of, what, the first one-quarter percent is 8 million 6 and the second quarter is another 8 million 6, so it says total available REET is the 17,2, yet on Exhibit B the last page in your summary you show a REET of 24,4. Can you explain where you get, if you can, the difference?

KOK: Yeah. Currently the table that you see in the figure that you see in the draft CFP is just a six-year horizon, the table that you see in the other handout there that you're referring to is I think a 20 year look.

LEIN: It shows it for (inaudible) years.

DUH: Actually I can add a little clarification to this. The table that's part of the capital facilities plan that parks is providing looks at the total dollar amount of projects that would utilize the REET which would be the 24 million. That assumes that about 13 and a half million is in the bank already and that the chart that's provided on Page 14 of the financial plan looks at additional revenues to be earned in the near future. So we have cash available in our funds now and then if you add the 8.6, you get closer to the 24.

LEIN: Okay. That explains the difference. Other questions?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I've got a couple. On the Table 2 under parks and open space on the capital facilities financial plan it says regional facilities acquisition and development 23,300,000 and I just wondered how much of that 23,300,000 is for acquisition and how much is for development since they both seem to be lumped together?

KOK: And actually we're looking at this table for the first time this evening, but I would venture to guess just that the vast majority of that figure would be on the acquisition side since that's where our primary focus is right now is to make up our regional park deficit to get closer to meeting the standard that we have.

MOSS: How do you meet the standard if you don't develop them?

KOK: Well, there's an acquisition standard and then there's a separate development standard.

MOSS: There may be, but I think this Board has been a little critical in the past of spending all the money on acquisition and not developing parks.

KOK: Right. Right. And our -- I think our philosophy has been to try to lock up as much land as we can because the County's developing so rapidly and the large chunks of property that meet our regional park standards are getting harder to get both just based on availability as well as affordability. We do take very seriously the fact that we need to follow that up quickly with park development and to the extent that we can feasibly



afford it that is built into the plan. It's easier for us with the funding sources that we have available now to purchase land and because of the relatively high maintenance cost and the limited capacity for the County to provide additional general fund dollars to finance maintenance of newly developed parks, that's where, that's why we have the focus on acquisition.

MOSS: Yeah, I understand that, and not to belabor the point, but we also have a lot of people who committed a lot of funding with the expectation that they would realize something from that and I'd hate to see a generation go without usable parks, you know, when their money was devoted to acquisition rather than to park development.

KOK: Right. And just a couple of examples in the CFP. You'll notice that Captain William Clark Park at Cottonwood Beach is a new regional park that we're currently working to develop in partnership with the Port of Camas/Washougal as well as the City of Camas and the City of Washougal, so that will be a new regional park that we will have on-line in the next couple of years. And then we're also in this CFP proposing a couple of enhancements to some other existing regional parks, namely Salmon Creek Park and Frenchman's Bar Park.

DELEISSEGUES: Lonnie and I have another question. On the last page, Page 18, I just wondered if the new regional park impact fees have been enacted already or is that something that has to be done in the future?

KOK: No, that's something that would be looked at into the future, that's not something we're proposing today or probably any time in the near future. That would certainly be something that we would work on once we got some direction from the Board of County Commissioners to pursue that.

DELEISSEGUES: But is the funding shown in the financial table predicated upon that passing?

KOK: Not in this plan, no, that's well beyond the six-year CFP window that we're proposing to update with you this evening.

DELEISSEGUES: That's certainly not what I would conclude reading the information that I've got in front of me here. It says "no new taxes or fees." Then goes on to say "a new regional park impact fee would be charged to development throughout the county. The Parks Division estimates this fee at \$950 per new dwelling," but no new taxes or fees, so I just had a question about which is it.

ORJIAKO: Commissioner, you're right. I think what I will add, Oliver Orjiako with Clark County Long-Range Planning section, there are some of the language in here within may appear confusing, it is something that we will recheck and edit it to make sure that it is accurately reflect what the entire document is saying. So that's one thing that we

will take back and check with Parks and other divisions just to make sure that this is, this accurately reflect what the entire text is saying. You're correct in a sense that when you say no new taxes or fees and then there is the following language that estimates what the new fees may be to each given household, that would appear contradictory, but when you really look at it in some cases, if you take the school district for example this is six years, the impact fees in some cases have already been established. So when you look at the six years that fee is included in your estimate. If you're going to be building a new house in any of the park district or school district, yes, additional fees will be assessed, but in terms of looking at your estimate within the six years you've included your bond if it has already been approved so any new home coming on-line will be assessed that, whatever that may be, but again we will take this document, clarify the language so that it is not contradictory in the way that it's read.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I would just hope that they implement the impact fee that some of that money can go to development of parks in the rural area.

ORJIAKO: I will agree with you.

LEIN: Any other questions? Does that conclude presentation on the capital facilities plans?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: Then I'll start with the sign-up sheet. We will request that as in past hearings you try to keep your testimony to about five minutes and we'll get a move on here. The first person Ellen Rogers.

AUDIENCE: Excuse me, I came in late from another meeting, but am I able to sign up on that list?

LEIN: Yes, once we get through here I'll open it to anyone coming before us.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

ROGERS: For the record, I am Ellen Rogers and I am the marketing and communications manager from the Port of Ridgefield. Good evening. Thank you for allowing me to testify this evening. The Port requests, the Port of Ridgefield is requesting that the transportation element of the Clark County capital facilities plan provide adequate resources for the preservation and maintenance of the existing rural arterial system in North Clark County, especially in the vicinity of Interstate 5. Further, the Port recommends that the transportation planning in the area recognize the

long-term economic and job development potential of the area between 134th Street and 319th Street, also known as the Discovery Corridor.

Transportation policies. In the spring of 2003 the Port of Ridgefield convened a working group of citizens and public officials to advise the Port Commission on transportation issues facing North Clark County. The purpose of the group was also to ask to develop a vision for transportation system throughout the Port district. During the course of the visioning the group discussed how citizens and employees would move east and west and north and south in the area in the next 50 years. The result of the session, see the attached map and the map projected up above, showed that Clark County had already had a very good bone structure in its transportation system. The existing system organized on a grid pattern provides north/south and east/west routes that allow people to move between their destinations without entering into the Interstate system. Currently most of these roads are unimproved rural roads, yet land use patterns are changing from rural to suburban. The system which may be adequate for today's volumes is expected to handle greater numbers of vehicle trips as the North County grows.

As the demand on the system increases and the County arterial system -- as the demand on the system increases and the county arterial system should be carefully managed and improved. Should transportation management and improvement significantly lag population growth, North County's livability and economic viability may be impaired. In addition, retrofitting transportation improvements after growth has occurred is much more difficult, expensive and inconvenient. The County capital facilities plan should make preservation of the rural arterial system in North County a high priority. The Port of Ridgefield believes that Interstate 5 is a regional asset that must be preserved to for interstate and inter-region trips. If local traffic were forced from the regional roads and loaded onto the Interstate, then our regional economy would suffer as goods would not be able to flow to and from their destinations, in our international ports or at their business facilities. Should this happen the competitive position, the ability to attract jobs and private investment of the entire county would be impaired. Clark County's rural arterial network is a key economic asset and its preservation and timely development is a key component needed to secure the future of Clark County. A strong arterial road system will allow people, goods and services to move freely.

The following policy statements have been developed by the Port of Ridgefield to guide our transportation divisions or decisions: Number one, we believe that Interstate 5 should be reserved for inter-region and interstate trips. Second, we believe that the existing arterials should be used to develop an efficient network of north/south and east/west routes to serve local traffic within the Discovery Corridor area. Third, a system of north/south and east/west arterials should be developed generally in a one mile grid pattern in order to provide vehicular traffic flow through North County, providing drivers routes into, out of and through the area without using Interstate 5 for

local trips. Fourth, direct arterial access to and from properties in the immediate vicinity of the I-5 interchanges should be limited to encourage unimpaired traffic flows near the junctions and to preserve flexibility for future improvements of the interchanges well into the future. Fifth, limited access arterials serving the Interstate interchanges should move vehicles away from the junctions with collectors developed to provide access back onto lands near the junctions. And, sixth, and finally, County and City transportation plans should promote development of primary, secondary and local arterials consistent with a long-term vision of North Clark County as a job center serving the surrounding communities. Thank you very much.

LEIN: Questions of Ms. Rogers? I have one. What do you see the responsibility of the Port, as well as possibly the City of Ridgefield, in participation of the development of funding the transportation improvements?

ROGERS: The Port, the City of Ridgefield is responsible for the roads within the city boundaries and the Port would be -- I couldn't speak directly for the Port, but I would assume that the Port would be responsible in helping to fund through grants and also through -- through grants and through funding transportation that way.

LEIN: Off-site of Port property or just on Port property?

ROGERS: Oh, I'm sorry, on Port property the Port would actually facilitate through purchasing or through funding transportation development and off-site the Port wouldn't assist.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Thank you.

ROGERS: Thank you very much.

LEIN: Lee Wells.

WELLS: For the record, I'm Lee Wells, president of the Ridgefield Junction Neighborhood Association. I'm just going to piggy back on top of what Ellen Rogers had to say. The neighborhood association has been directly involved with this planning process and this mapping that has been done by the Port. Also we've been involved with the City of Ridgefield with their capital facilities plan. Their capital facilities plan does tie into some of those sections around the Junction. And in your maps that you have there there's several little dotted lines, that's proposed roads that should be put on the map for the future. Maybe we won't do them this year or next year, but ten years down the road. We had a dotted line that we put on the map seven years ago in the Ridgefield capital facilities plan, which was the Pioneer Street extension, that wasn't carried through, we were back here last spring trying to get that added to it. That land was put on your recommendation to the County Commissioners. The land has been purchased by a developer, been donated to the City, that's going to be part of the City

of Ridgefield's capital facility plan for you and that road will be built next year without any of the County funding if it's put in the urban growth boundary.

The other thing I was going to say is this is just a conceptual drawing, there's approximately ten miles of road that would grid up all of North County and we're trying to look for the future and be visionary. And the dotted lines may not be site-specific, but they're conceptual. And if we get these ties in, we won't be fighting 134th or Mill Plain or whatever. We're trying to plan for the future so that we can eliminate those problems before they arise. Is there any other questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Wells? Thank you, sir.

WELLS: Thank you.

LEIN: Laura Hudson.

HUDSON: I'm Laura Hudson, I'm the Long-Range Planning Manager from the City of Vancouver. And one of the basic reasons for the adoption of the Growth Management Act was to ensure that public facilities and services would be available at the time that development occurred, but that's been one of the hardest things that we've had to do over the past decade. Both Clark County and Vancouver have had moratoria on transportation because of the trouble keeping up with providing the facilities at the time that the development occurred. We're concerned that the proposed preferred alternative will make that problem worse as we go into the future. Under the preferred alternative UGA expansion, transportation capital costs alone are 2.6 billion countywide and we don't see where that funding is coming from. We're also concerned that there's an inconsistent approach in how the City is handling its land use and capital facilities planning and how the County is at this point.

In the City the projected growth in the land use element is the same as the projected growth in the capital facilities plan, that's not true for the County plan. The inclusion of a market factor for industrial and commercial development means that you have substantially higher capacity planned for and that you have to fund under your capital facilities element than you show in your land use population and employment projections. That's in direct contradiction to some Western Washington Growth Hearings Board case law that says you should be using the same growth projections for both your land use planning and your capital facilities planning. And it increases the cost that you have to bear in an area that you have to plan for into the future.

I'm particularly concerned because the State law already requires you to have a market factor in there. You're basically planning for 20 years of growth in a plan that you know you will have to under State law update in ten years, you have 100 percent market factor built into the plan already. To add a market factor on top of it and cause yourselves to be inconsistent in your capital facilities and land use planning doesn't

strike me as a wise approach. We are as a result urging you yet again not to expand the Vancouver urban growth area beyond those pieces we've already requested. In our letter to you from last May those would be the areas to the east of the existing Vancouver urban growth area and would urge you to put any other areas to the north, and particularly along I-5, into an urban reserve category if you feel that eventually they'll be needed. Based on our population and employment projections we believe that we can accommodate the population and employment allocated to the city of Vancouver within the existing urban growth area and the areas that we propose to expand to to the east and would urge you to limit the expansion to that for us and consider revising your plan, your County plan, to make the population and employment projections using capital facilities the same as those in land use. Thank you.

LEIN: Are there any questions of Ms. Hudson? Okay. Thank you. Reg Martinson.

MARTINSON: My comments are site-specific and if I heard correctly those comments are appropriate at the end of this discussion on capital facilities plans.

LEIN: Okay. Dave Halme.

HALME: The same.

LEIN: Okay. Dennis Osborn.

OSBORN: Dennis Osborn, Planning Director for the City of Battle Ground. For the record, just turning in a letter regarding our concerns about the capital facilities plan. Brian Carrico from our office presented that last Thursday in anticipation that you were going to have capital facilities discussion then, so it's already in the record, we just want to reenter it tonight since those are the topics, so sort of just a reiteration of what we've already presented to you and that's it. I don't want to take a whole lot of your time.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Osborn? We received this last week.

RUPLEY: I have one for him not related necessarily specifically to his letter. Have you had a meeting with your school district yet on your proposed plan?

OSBORN: Not yet but that is scheduled, a joint meeting with the Council and the school district in December.

RUPLEY: In December?

OSBORN: That's my understanding.

RUPLEY: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: John Karpinski.

KARPINSKI: My name is John Karpinski, I'm here on behalf of Clark County Natural Resources Council. Under growth management there's two basic concepts for capital facilities plans, one is the County's capital facilities plan is an umbrella plan that takes in everybody else's plans, of course we haven't done that here. And second, you can't grow faster than you can afford and of course we haven't done that here either.

Let me talk about those two points. First, it's a growth management 101 kind of concept that the County's plan is supposed to be a compilation of all the other plans and how everything fits together. Here we don't have the Cities capital facilities plan, we don't have the schools capital facilities plan, we don't know where 2 billion of the \$2.6 billion in road funds are going to be coming from. This is a per se violation of Washington's Growth Management Act. I don't know why we're hurrying ahead without this information. It seems we're concerned that the numbers are going to get uglier and I'll talk about the numbers and they're ugly already. And even if you look at the final EIS, and this is great, if you look at Page 149 there's a chart that looks like part of the chart is missing, there's revenues and or there's costs of what appear to be revenues, if you look at the -- but it's blank on this side for where the revenues were. If you look at the bottom it says revenues are based on dah, dah, dah, dah, dah, there's no revenues on this page at all. It looks like the revenue numbers got really ugly and they were just simply excised from the documents because we don't know where the \$2 billion is coming from.

Let me talk specifically about the money because, you know, everybody wants to grow when you're making money from it, but nobody wants to spend the money to get the infrastructure to get there. You have a State road system, what I passed over to you was some of the latest documents I got from the County that said how much for each of the -- now this is from the draft EIS, this is for the five different alternatives, it shows about a \$1 billion deficit in the State highway system between what is the cost and what are the revenues. I tried to get good numbers for what, well, what is it now. Okay. This is what it was, what is it now. The document I got was an E-mail to a Columbian reporter that estimated that things were now down to only a half a billion dollars. Okay. Now to me whether it's a half a billion or a billion you have a problem. The Growth Board already knocked out the County's last growth management plan because it was 200 million short, now you got somewhere between a half a billion and a billion dollars shortfall in the State funding system alone, what are we going to do with it. And I think this is better numbers than what I saw from the other but it really doesn't matter, the point is is that the State system is in collapse and we have to deal with it and you're in denial if you don't.

Now that's not the only problem we have. We have the County system. The County system is \$137.5 million in the hole and how are we going to deal with that. You know, is this the all failing roads lead to Battle Ground map because that's what we're talking

about. If you read from the staff report, the staff report says we can't support the plan that we have. The major Battle Ground urban area expansion appears to generate transportation demand that exceeds the planned rural system transportation capacity to handle it. We can't handle the growth we're talking about. They make the same point for the fairgrounds area. We've simply bitten off more than we can chew and we have to realistically say what are we going to do about it because growth management says we have to balance it. So now -- and we don't know what the other deficits are. We don't know what the schools are, we don't know where we're going to come up with the money for the 30 additional schools for this preferred alternative, we don't have a good schools capital, or excuse me, Cities capital facilities plan. The water and sewer, the staff report says none of their plans deal with this level of growth. We don't know any of this stuff and we're going ahead and planning for all this growth when we don't have any clue as to how we're going to pay for it.

Okay. You know, it's funny, you know, me the environmental radical up here is the fiscal conservative saying how the heck are we going to pay for all this stuff. Okay. And we need answers. Okay. What does the, what does the Final Environmental Impact Statement say. Well, we're either going to do one of two things, we're either going to reduce our level of growth or we're going to reduce the level-of-service. Why don't we talk about both of those. Reducing the level of growth, once you expand the urban growth boundaries if it's not in urban holding, what happened last time is that the development goes right to the edge of the boundary because that's where the developers make the fattest profits and how are you going to unring that bell. Once you zone it and they start building it, how do you really shrink the amount of growth we have, not a realistic option. So what's going to happen is what we've done every single time before is we're going to lower the level-of-service. Okay. Well, first of all question, how much are we going to have to lower the level-of-service and can we actually lower it enough to do the job, no one's figured it out yet. Now it at some point in time on the Mill Plain corridor they did modeling, they did an analysis, this is a diminishing marginal return sort of thing, once you drop it below, on Mill Plain it was between 9 and 10 miles an hour, you could drop it to zero miles an hour and you don't get any more trips, the system crashes. Have we done the analysis that even if we just colossally let the road system fail in a spectacular fashion, do we still have the road capacity. My belief is we don't, but shouldn't we at least study it before we decide to add all this additional land to the urban growth boundary. Also from an environmental point of view, okay, what is the environmental impacts in terms of air quality. We're this far from being a nonattainment area. Nonattainment area for air quality means there's a lot of extra standards on factories, businesses don't want to come there, so what's going to be the impact on air pollution and therefore jobs if we let the road system colossally fail. And if you look at the attached map, you know, this is more red than an Enron spreadsheet. You know, the Ridgefield people just came up and said we need to have the rural system working. If you look on the map the rural system is not working at all in this proposal, the rural system fails.



So how are we going to fix this problem. What about safety, what about quality of life, what about jobs, how many major employers move to an area, you know, this whole thing is for jobs, look at all the red, this whole thing is for jobs, how many major employers move to an area when the roads don't work. Does this make any sense. Do we -- aren't we supposed to figure -- this is supposed to be planning, we're supposed to figure this stuff out first and then decide how fast we grow, not figure out how fast we grow and then try to figure out some way of making it work. Okay. This is a really basic simple concept that isn't being done and it's up to you folks to do something about it because it ain't happening over here. I have a lot of respect for the County staff, I'm working with them, this is going forward, it's up to you to do something about it.

Now here's what I think we can do. First of all we can put all this stuff in urban holding. Now I'm concerned about that because I'm worried the stuff can get annexed and built anyway because once it gets out of the County control and into, you know, Battle Ground, you know, they can, Battle Ground can annex that tomorrow, all bets are off. How does the system work. You know, it's a nice theory that urban holding can fix the problem, but I don't think it can, that's the problem that I have. So what I think the solution is is you can only grow as fast as you can afford, we can't afford much, we probably can't even afford Alternative 3. What I think you have to do -- now normally you have discretion to do your population anywhere you want as long as you can put together in my mind a legal plan, well, we can't put together a legal plan. So in my mind, then, you have to come as close as you can to a legal plan which would be Alternative 3 with a 1.0 growth rate. Or I mean if you can afford 1.2 or, you know, whatever it works out to be, but let's be honest here, let's be realistic about what we can afford and what the impacts of that is going to be and our quality of life and our jobs and let's do some real planning and make some real decisions here. That's what I'd ask you to do. And I think we're going to need once we make that decision of what we're doing with the road standards, how we're going to afford this and how much we're going to let the system just crash, we're going to need to do a supplemental environmental impact statement because none of this stuff is dealt with. Saying, okay, we're going to let all the roads crash, here's the environmental impacts of that, here's the land use impacts of that, here's what we're really doing here because none of this stuff has been looked at. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Karpinski?

RUPLEY: I think that what you're recommending is we not adopt this plan until we have some of the basic information that you've described in terms of the other --

KARPINSKI: Yes.

RUPLEY: -- is that what you're saying?

KARPINSKI: That would be Alternative 1. Alternative 2 is if you're going to adopt

something anyway, you reduce the growth levels to the -- you adopt essentially Alternative 3, you look at the population projections necessary to bring the plan in as close to balance as the plan can be brought into balance.

RUPLEY: Okay, thanks.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Karpinski.

KARPINSKI: Thank you.

LEIN: Glen Thornton.

THORNTON: For the record, my name is Glen Thornton. I reside at 7617 NE 119th Street. I have a request before the County and for a zone change and it's under case Number 2001-075.

LEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Thornton, could we conclude the testimony on the capital facilities and then we'll get to the site-specific.

THORNTON: Okay. I'm here because my name was called. I'd be very happy to do that.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you. The sign-up sheet was for capital facilities and we will get to site-specific as soon as we're done.

THORNTON: Well, let me ask you a question. Am I at the right place?

LEIN: Yes, you are.

THORNTON: Okay. I don't want to wait around. How long do you think I'll be?

LEIN: It depends how many people in the audience want to testify on capital facilities. It doesn't look like it's going to be too long.

THORNTON: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to testify on the capital facilities portion of the plan? All right. Mr. Thornton, are you ready?

THORNTON: Now that I'm warmed up.

LEIN: Thank you, sir.

THORNTON: Well, thank you for the opportunity to be able to make these comments. This property --

MOSS: Mr. Thornton, can you give your address again.

THORNTON: 7617 NE 119th Street. I reside at that address and then that's also the address of the property and subject property.

LEIN: Could you give the case number again too, Mr. Thornton.

THORNTON: Yes, 2001-075.

LEIN: Thank you.

THORNTON: And this property, the subject property, the cross streets are NE 72nd Avenue and NE 119th Street. The subject property is just a little bit east of 72nd Avenue and it's on the south side of 119th Street. It's currently inside the Vancouver urban growth boundary. I have requested in my case file that this property be zoned R1-6 rather than ML or their proposed BP. Following reasons is it's a large parcel with a minimum sensitive area. It's very -- it would be very harmonious with some of the other area, property in the area that's zoned R1-6. For instance the property to the east is zoned R1-6. There's a proposed annex, extension of the growth boundary on the north side of 119th Street which has mixed use which involves residential and then there's a large parcel about one half mile northwest of the subject property that's also zoned R1-6. This property is nearly flat. It's gentle actually, it has a gentle slope to the east. It would be ideal for residential development. There would be minimum earth movement. But when you think of a use around a house the property is flat or nearly flat, it would be all usable, there's no banks, dips, draws or anything like that. It has a very nice soil which I've been farming for 35 years that if you want to grow flowers, you want to do any gardening or anything, lawns, it's very compatible. And then I guess lastly I feel that the sensitive areas could be more environmentally treated through a residential development rather than ML or BP. Thank you.

LEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Thornton, you said it was a large parcel. Do you know how many acres?

THORNTON: Yes, there are 52 acres.

LEIN: Thank you.

MOSS: Mr. Thornton, is this the Christmas tree farm?

THORNTON: Yes, sir, it is.

MOSS: Okay, thanks.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Mr. Martinson.

MARTINSON: Thank you. My name is Reg Martinson, I'm the director of facilities for Evergreen School District located at 13501 NE 28th in Vancouver. I'm here to testify this evening on behalf of the Evergreen School District related to a property owner's request to change the land use designation on a 56-acre parcel located near NE 1st and NE 202nd Avenue. The parcels specifically in question are 176160-000, 176165-000 and 176166-000.

We understand that the property owner has submitted a formal request to Clark County by a letter dated September 5th, 2003 asking that their property be included in the Camas urban growth area and that the property be rezoned from Ag-20 to Business Park. The Evergreen School District is in full support of that request. We are currently in the concluding stages of a negotiation to purchase this property from the current property owner on which we intend to place a comprehensive high school to be collocated with a new east branch campus of Clark College. The zoning of the property to business park will facilitate the development of this school site because as you know schools are a permitted use or outright use in business park zones.

On a related issue the District requests that the property be removed from the current urban holding overlay designation. As we understand it, the purpose of the urban holding overlay is to protect large parcels from subdivisions until the time that the City annexes the property. Removing the property in question from the urban holding overlay will not weaken this policy in that the District plans to use the entire property exclusively for the construction of a school in cooperation and collocation with Clark College. As such the urban holding overlay will only have the effect of changing the use of the site for a school from a permitted use to a conditional use. The time and cost required for a conditional use permit could jeopardize the construction of the school on the property and is unnecessary given that any concerns about public roads, water, sewer, drainage and related issues, which we understand are the kinds of issues that the urban overlay is intended to flag, will be addressed in site plan review at the County level.

Furthermore, because the school district will be located on property zoned business park, the District will be required to submit a Type II review process. As such the District requests that the urban holding overlay be removed from this particular parcel. We strongly urge that the Planning Commission favorably consider the request that we're putting forward at this time and that that be included in your recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Martinson?

DELEISSEGUES: What's the size of this parcel?

MARTINSON: It's 56 acres.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

RUPLEY: And what's your estimated time for building?

MARTINSON: We're looking at occupancy of this facility in -- for the high school portion of it in the fall of 2006.

RUPLEY: I have a question for staff. Is that a possibility to make for a request?

LEE: Is what a possibility?

RUPLEY: Well, I mean I understand the zoning part, but the urban holding that you could remove from a parcel, is that -- I mean that's --

LEE: It would be very unlikely if urban holding were applied in the surrounding area that it would be removed from one individual parcel. I think the question the Planning Commission would have to answer is whether it's appropriate to apply it over a broader area.

RUPLEY: Okay, thanks. That's all I have.

LEIN: Other questions? Thank you. Mr. Halme.

HALME: My name is David Halme. You'll have to excuse me, I'm coming down with laryngitis. I'm the director of plan services at Clark College. On behalf of Clark College I'd like to reinforce the comments that were made by Mr. Martinson. As he indicated, that Clark College and the school district are embarking on an exciting new partnership to bring a college satellite facility collocated adjacent to Evergreen High Schools planned high school. The issues that he brought out dealing with the urban growth overlay and the zoning are certainly important issues that we would ask you to consider as they would complicate this collocation or the development of this collocated property. I won't reiterate the comments that he made, you've already heard them, but I'd be pleased to answer any questions that you may have as it relates to the college's involvement.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Halme?

RUPLEY: Mine's just a curiosity question. What kinds of things will you offer in your satellite campus?

HALME: I think it's the intent of the college to bring our full mission. Our full mission as a comprehensive community college is essentially bringing those programs that are needed in that geographical area. I would suspect that there's going to be an emphasis on technology and certainly transfer programs as it relates to our mission to transferring to higher education.

RUPLEY: Thank you.

HALME: My pleasure.

LEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Halme. Typically a school district will build a high school in its entirety rather than phases. Do you plan on having more than one phase to your facility or do you know at this point?

HALME: Our master plan did indicate that there could potentially be two phases to the college's involvement on our east county satellite. Phase I was identified as a 60,000-square foot multistory building. Phase II an additional 60,000-square foot building but that would be some years into the future.

LEIN: Thank you.

HALME: I'm honored to introduce to you my guest this evening. I will take the opportunity to introduce to you the new president of Clark College. He's been with us seven weeks, Dr. Wayne Branch.

BRANCH: Good evening and thanks for the opportunity to tag on to what these two gentlemen have said. I just wanted to be clear that the college is looking at purchasing -- or the college foundation is looking at purchasing an additional 10 to 15 acres that are immediately adjacent to the 56 acres that Reg is talking about and so our desire that the urban overlay not impact the school district's purchase of the property should also be considered for the additional 10 to 15 acres that the college is looking at also and so that there's a broader perspective than the Strong property on the application of the overlay for this collaborative relationship and so I just wanted to make sure that that point was not lost.

It should also be noted that the college has already obtained from the State the funds necessary to conceptualize design, as well as build the facilities, and so the appropriation are in hand, well, now in the pipeline, the appropriations are in the pipeline, and so most assuredly any kind of cost impact that the overlay may bring to the project, again as was stated for Evergreen, also has the potential to put into jeopardy our ability to purchase the property and build with dollars that are already limited for the project.

LEIN: Questions of Dr. Branch? Thank you, sir.

BRANCH: Great. Thank you.

LEIN: Anyone else wishing to testify on site-specific issues? Will you please come forward, state your name and address for the record.

FENN: My name is Jim Fenn and I have a property -- or actually I reside at 5511 NE 75 Street in Vancouver. The property in question, the subject property, is 13506 NE 72nd Ave, Vancouver. I just want to at this point bring to your attention my particular property. I understand the zoning that is going to be handed down will be R1-7.5 which is a nice zoning for that particular area, it's a lot of older homes and lots of large parcels, that's what you're looking for. 72nd Avenue is an undeveloped corridor, largely one of the last ones and, but my particular property has commercial use and it has for the last 30 years. I haven't owned it 30 years and I've owned it since about '96 and we've got commercial offices, shop, parking lot, things like that. We also have -- it's kind of a mixed use deal, we've got a care-take residence and a single-family and we'd like to continue doing that. I don't see it feasible to knock all that down to put up homes down the road and take out the businesses that are in there. It makes no sense to me. It's all about jobs and feeding our families and all that and so I just wanted to bring your attention to that.

In talking with Ms. Towne this morning, Sandra Towne I believe it is, on the phone, she asked me to bring an overlay, or actually I've got a letter to turn in asking for a site-specific. And I also have an aerial of the site and you can see the buildings and whatnot that's on here and it's plain to see that houses don't quite work.

LEIN: Could you provide the aerial over here.

FENN: You bet.

LEIN: That will help us.

FENN: Here's the letter and there's the aerial, the subject property right there. There you go. 72nd runs north/south right there, exactly. The parking lot is up on the upper right, gravel. And you can see just off that parking lot down below the parking lot is a shop and office building, the big green stretch down below where the fingernail is is single-family with a big front lawn, and out back is nursery property, greenhouses and that kind of thing. We have Mary Ann right next door to the south down below, she owns 16 acres. She plans to stay. She's had the realtor traffic and developers door knocking and calling and that kind of thing and she's a little lady just kind of wants to stay put and that's the neat thing. So the church is just to the north and they rent my parking lot Sunday's and Wednesday's. Without that parking lot they'd be kind of out of luck. And we'd certainly encourage the church to stay, they're great people, they only

have an acre, it's a sad thing they don't have enough parking for their congregation. So anyway, that's my point on that. It's not like we're looking to build commercial and want to go after the big bucks, that's not the idea, it's already here so. Any questions of me?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Fenn?

LEE: I have a question. You indicated that a portion of your parcel is residential. Are you looking for the entire area to be commercial including that residential?

FENN: You know, that's a good point, I do not know that, maybe so. It's spendy to move a house and all that I suppose, I'm not a developer, but again, if you have a smaller -- this piece is 3.32 acres in its entirety, the folks behind me and with all the trees there to the west do not want to sell. And it's a family deal, mom lives across the street, kids live across the street so they're staying put too. Some of this stuff that's getting, you know, rezoned and whatnot, people aren't going to sell. You know, even this one lady next to me was talking, you know, a million bucks or whatever it was and, you know, she's like 80 years old, what's she going to do with a million bucks, she's going to go find a condo for 200 and, you know, and have a good time with her grandkids I guess. But she doesn't want to do that, she's been there for 60 years.

MOSS: Was that testimony in favor of a market factor?

FENN: So -- but any rate, that's my particular view on my piece. And, you know, the church wants to stay put and, you know, down the road the church wants to buy my property if it ever came up for sale and we'll see how that one goes, but, yeah, they certainly wouldn't want to probably pay commercial prices for that so I guess that would be the downside, but that's what I see on that piece. The question of mixed residential versus commercial, I guess it would be tougher commercial to sell a piece or develop a piece if it's, you know, sitting at two acres on a small like of stripy center. Or I don't know, I don't know what would ever go in there, you know, Taco Bell or something, I don't know. I can't see that. I'm thinking more, you know, something, you know, kind of support the rest of the houses.

If everybody sells off eventually, there will be a boat load of houses out there and they're going to need all the different services, you know, the Papa Murphy's. Or I guess the 119th and 72nd Avenue is doing the big shopping anchor tenant eventually in the next two years I believe, year and a half, that's coming right up, I know that. Sewer will be out there so it's going to be a big explosion if people will sell off. That's going to be the big, big deal so. So I don't know. That question is if we can have a smaller piece, you know, maybe the frontage say be commercial and the back with residential, something like that, certainly look at that, yeah. I don't know if we can. How do you do, divide it up into several parcels I guess.

LEE: Yeah, I was just curious because you mentioned it was residence and didn't see it



going anywhere so I was just trying to clarify if your proposal was for the entire property. The logical way to do it would be to split the parcel and divide off a piece as a that includes the residential and the commercial, but you may be right about the size of the parcel and commercial utility.

FENN: Yeah, that's what I hear is, you know, these smaller pieces you can't do anything with so.

LEIN: Mr. Fenn, you said the commercial use, is it primarily the nursery that's commercial or is there additional commercial?

FENN: It is landscape right now, nursery, retail, wholesale that kind of thing, that's going on the property right now. It's been zoned that way for way, way of a long time.

LEIN: There's just one business there right now?

FENN: There's a couple. We've got the nursery is one, landscape is another, and there's some storage and a warehouse facility so.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you.

FENN: Thank you.

LEIN: The next gentleman.

CARLSON: My name is Loren Carlson and I have to apologize for not being prepared for tonight, I just spent the last six days in Disneyland with a 5 and 7-year-old. But mine --

LEIN: You're lucky to make it back.

CARLSON: Yeah, I was lucky. This has to do with the property at 6101 NE 109th Avenue. It's the property that surrounds the Orchards Feed Mill. We started this process about three years ago trying to get it rezoned from R1-7.5 to commercial. We were working towards that and then we were told to wait until the comprehensive plan took shape and tried to address it at that point. So we waited and went forward on that and submitted, and then when we got to that point we were told that everything was kind of thrown out and they weren't going to look at site-specific at this point. But I was also told that they were wanting more commercial development for job creation over putting in houses. Everything around where the feed store is presently is commercial, that and Covington Middle School. It's about a three-acre piece that surrounds the feed store and basically what we're doing is we're looking to be able to expand the feed store. The business is 115-years-old, it's the oldest existing building in Orchards, and we're just trying to maintain its integrity and move forward. So I guess we're just here to

try to voice our opinion that we'd like to have that looked at again by everybody.

LEIN: Mr. Carlson, have you made a formal application for this part of the process?

LEE: We have an SSR file number on it, it's 2001-014.

LEIN: 014, thank you. Any questions of Mr. Carlson? Thank you, sir.

CARLSON: Thanks.

COLLENTINE: Good evening. My name is David Collentine and I represent the Kiewit Construction Company and I'm here to provide some testimony on the comprehensive plan in regards to a piece of property we own at 18637 SE Evergreen Highway, and for the benefit of the Planning Commission I've brought several copies of the letter that I'd like to read into the public record and I have these available for staff if they'd like to distribute them and make them part of the public record. I have more if you need more.

As I said, Kiewit Construction Company is the owner of a 14-acre parcel located at 18637. A letter that I've submitted tonight has been prepared by Kiewit's real estate manager Paul White out of our corporate office in Omaha, Nebraska. The Kiewit and its affiliates have owned this 14-acre parcel in Clark County for nearly 20 years. It is in the unincorporated portion of Clark County and lies between the Evergreen Highway and the Columbia River. The street address as I said is 18637 SE Evergreen. Besides this property, Kiewit continues to operate its business from its Columbia House Boulevard office in Vancouver just as it has done for the last -- since the mid 1950s. We understand that the County is updating its comprehensive plan and our property has been identified as a parcel for a zoning change. The proposed zoning classification is business park. You've heard earlier of other individuals that have that, their land designated for business park purposes. We believe this is not an appropriate classification of our land given its past uses, its current use and anticipated future use.

In this regard Kiewit Pacific is requesting, or excuse me, Kiewit is requesting that the existing zoning of heavy industrial be retained. The property has been home for continuously operating a sawmill since nearly the 1950s. The land has been used for direct river access to the nearby Fisher Quarry to allow barge transportation of construction materials both to the quarry and from the quarry. Outside of these type of business activities the property has also been used for storage of construction materials, equipment, log decking, timber manufacturing and continues the operation of that sawmill as I indicated. There is a rail spur that directly accesses the property and that is a rail spur directly off the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad line and we have had rail operations on portions of that site since the time we've owned the property. These type of activities provide a number of family wage jobs since the time that it has been used for industrial purposes and we believe these are the best and most beneficial type of jobs that the County needs at this time. These jobs are all relating to the use of

the property for operation of a sawmill, operation of the quarry nearby, loading and unloading of materials from both barges and trains and other manufacturing construction jobs. We believe that these type of basic industry positions of employment should be retained and that the heavy industrial zoning designation is appropriate to be retained in this condition.

The growth of the community's economy depends on a large extent to the basic industries. We, our company, believes that basic industries are important to our core business areas and we have a strong need for raw materials and those including whatever construction materials. The combination of access to transportation modes, including barges and trains, coupled with the industrial zoning supports our basic industry needs and those that -- of the existing land as it's designated heavy industrial. We believe this is absolutely essential. Kiewit was one of the largest construction companies in North America and our senior real estate manager and myself involved in planning of land use issues for the company here in the local area believe these kinds of properties are very difficult to find with these combined modes of transportation and they are hard to develop because they are being impinged upon by local, or excuse me, urban growth trends.

We are currently asking that this property be retained, as I said, in the heavy industrial. These type of characteristics that I've described are hard to find in Clark County. We do not believe this is a good candidate parcel for zoning, rezoning as a business park. There are several reasons for this. There is not adequate water and sewer and other services that are in close proximity to the site that would enable business park development and there are many other locations that are more suited to a business park development in the areas that are underutilized in this designation already. And as well separately, there's the parcel itself is a long and narrow parcel, it is bordered by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad to the north and there's a single point of access off the Evergreen Highway, and it includes in that grade railroad crossing over the main line. And as many of you may know there's quite a bit of heavy train traffic on that main line so it would not easily accommodate a business park development. So we do not believe this is a long-term best appropriate use for this property and we request that the zoning be retained as heavy industrial.

Separately, and maybe due to omission in the planning staff's notification processes or our own omission in terms of staying abreast of the comprehensive planning process, we were not informed of this zoning or rezone and we would appreciate the opportunity to have -- to comment on the comprehensive plan and that we be notified at our corporate headquarters which are on this letterhead. One of our primary purposes, as I said, of this property is the continued manufacturing of timber products and tonight Bob Lewis of Columbia Vista Corp, the president of Columbia Vista Corp, is here to provide some testimony on this same issue. Thank you. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions before Mr. Lewis comes forward?

COLLENTINE: Thank you.

RUPLEY: I have one.

COLLENTINE: Oh, sorry.

RUPLEY: Actually I have a couple. How many employees are on-site?

COLLENTINE: I'll let Mr. Lewis respond to that because we are not the operator of the manufacturing business, he's the owner of Columbia Vista.

LEWIS: You said a couple.

RUPLEY: I have a couple of questions.

COLLENTINE: On the manufacturing?

RUPLEY: And I suspect maybe you can answer all of them. If not he can come back up.

LEWIS: My name is Bob Lewis, I'm president and principal of Columbia Vista Corporation. And you guys are awesome, you have to listen to everybody telling you what you're supposed to do and you sit there and listen and you do a pretty job of paying attention. I don't think I could do that.

LEIN: Mr. Lewis, could you give your address for the record, please.

LEWIS: 18637 SE Evergreen Highway.

LEIN: Thank you.

LEWIS: Columbia Vista Corporation or its predecessor has occupied this location since 1952. In the early 1950s, as some of you may remember, there were over 50 sawmills in Clark County. In fact the first sawmill in north, the Northwest, was built just a little bit down the road from our location. Today there are two sawmills left. Our company provides 82 family wage positions. We'll do \$30 million in business this year. 20 percent of our sales go to Japan, 20 percent are what's called a crossover transmission or utility poles, in fact we'll make 70 percent of all of that item sold to all of North America this year, and 52 percent of our sales go to Home Depot. If you were to go to Home Depot and buy a green Douglas Fir 4-by-4, look at the grade stamp, it will say Columbia Vista on it. I would also provide a kiln dried product for them that goes into the northwest or northeast area.

We obviously are in favor of leaving this property operating in the heavy industrial zoning which it's been forever. The things that he shared with you earlier about the difficulty of developing it as a business park are clearly evident if you go and visit the site. Historically it's been heavy industry. Again, it provides 82 family wage jobs. It's a viable entity. And I'm not sure why the planners were interested in seeing if it could be changed to a business park designation, but we clearly are not in favor of that proposed change so.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Lewis?

LEWIS: Yes.

RUPLEY: How many trucks go in and out of there? One of the issues of not doing business park was the fact that it would not accommodate the heavy traffic pattern. How many trucks do you have that go in and out of there on a daily basis?

LEWIS: We're around 25 to 27 trucks a day.

RUPLEY: So there is (inaudible) --

LEWIS: There is a gated crossing and there have been instances of problems just down the road from us with a death not that long ago and other things, but there are about 27 trucks a day that go in and out. Great. Thanks for the opportunity.

RUPLEY: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Anyone else wishing to testify on a piece of property, site-specific or the capital facilities plan or any other item that we've had in the last four weeks, five weeks?

MOSS: Who remembers.

LEIN: They just run together. Okay, with that, I'll close the public hearing. Mr. Lee, we discussed at the workshop today about the possibility of continuing the hearing next week for some opening in general comments or site-specific issues. Is that a recommendation from staff?

LEE: We were aware that some people were going to show up tonight so I didn't want to, you know, absolutely preclude that from happening. As far as staff is concerned, you could either close the public hearing tonight or you could wait and provide one more opportunity. Either way is okay with us.

LEIN: Okay. Desires of the Commission?

MOSS: It doesn't sound as though we're going to have a lot of participation next time

and it probably wouldn't hurt to leave it open just in case one or two folks haven't had the opportunity, so I guess my preference would be to do that.

LEIN: Is that consensus? Okay, I just want to make sure that the public is aware of that too.

LEE: Yeah, we will as a minimum get a press release out tomorrow indicating that we would expect testimony to be taken for one last time next week and after that that the public hearing would be closed and deliberations would begin.

LEIN: Next week's hearing would be here at 6:30; correct?

LEE: That is correct.

DELEISSEGUES: At City Hall?

LEIN: At City Hall, here. Is there a need for a workshop next week for any reason other than to talk about deliberations potentially?

LEE: That would probably be the topic of the work session if we were to have one, how to approach the deliberations.

LEIN: Anyone wishing to deliberate tonight?

DELEISSEGUES: So is there a workshop next week or not?

LEIN: I would anticipate --

LEE: What I gather from the head nods is that you believe it is the best interest to allow testimony through next Thursday, but that the expectation would be that public testimony would be closed next week.

DELEISSEGUES: How about the workshop?

LEIN: But the workshop, I think the workshop would cover the anticipated way to do deliberations and in what order, et cetera?

LEE: It could be in sequencing. We could share with you some of the exhibits we've prepared that try and identify the various land use changes that have been identified either through City proposals or through site-specific requests, you could ask us questions to make sure you understood what they represented, the keys and whatnot.

LEIN: I would anticipate next week we will get into deliberations and if we can do that in one night, what do you think the odds are?

MOSS: Oh, wonderful.

LEIN: Anything else, Mr. Lee?

DELEISSEGUES: So is there a workshop or not?

LEIN: Anything else for --

MOSS: Yeah, there's a workshop.

LEE: Any further questions on capital facilities based on the testimony you heard either that you'd like us to return with an answer to next week or that we might be able to answer now?

LEIN: The only thing I think we've heard a couple of times from Mr. Karpinski, Mr. Lowry, is the fact that he feels that without a suitable plan that's balanced budget it's going to get tossed out. Your comments on that?

LOWRY: He's correct. And that's the current stage where we are now, the capital facilities planning hasn't caught up with the land use planning. We got a remand in '94 for just such an inconsistency and it took us four years to solve the problem.

DUST: Six.

LOWRY: Six years?

DUST: Six years to solve it fully.

LOWRY: To solve it fully. And the issues that are facing us today are magnitudes greater than were faced in '94; however, we did learn some things I think in those six years so we're probably a little more efficient in trying to figure out some answers, but there is -- the other that's different between now and 1994, in 1994 we adopted one urban growth boundary for the Vancouver UGA and for each of the other Cities, it would have been very difficult for the Hearings Board to issue an order of invalidity based upon that inconsistency between the plan and the facilities plan because that would have precluded any additional development within any of the UGAs. This time around we're dealing with expanding the UGAs and it's going to be much easier for the Hearings Board if based upon that inconsistency to issue an order of invalidity that would apply only to the expansion areas. So, I mean, again I think what staff is recommending is to address that problem is we simply put the expansion areas all in holding and expect that and agree that the plan has to be remanded to the County by the Hearings Board in order to do the necessary capital facilities plan work.

MOSS: How long do we anticipate that's going to take?

LOWRY: Well, I think if we try to --

MOSS: Six years was the history last time.

LOWRY: Yes. And but as I say, I think we got somewhere a little bit higher on the learning curve during that time.

MOSS: So we could do this in five?

LOWRY: I think. I don't know that if you're talking about solving all of the issues, the State highway system issues, the Battle Ground issues, the whole bailiwick, I don't know if we could do it in 20, but if you're --

MOSS: I agree.

LOWRY: -- if we're talking about biting off reasonable portions, figuring out where we can afford to grow, doing six-year projections and seeing where we are, yeah, I think that's doable for next year.

LEIN: So in essence the plan that we forward and then the Board works through will not be a final plan by the time it's adopted because it will be lacking the capital facilities?

LOWRY: Yes. And I also have to agree legally with Mr. Karpinski that the legally correct thing to do at this point would be not adopt the plan, but there's so much behind this effort to this point that that's probably not a realistic option. So I think what we're going to end up doing is adopting a plan we know is going to get remanded.

LEIN: Then that means that comes back to us also because of the capital facilities implications?

LOWRY: Yes.

LEE: But from the other any perspective, frankly, any plan we adopt is going to be remanded anyway.

LOWRY: I also agree with that.

LEE: And from my perspective I think it is very important to freeze some lines as we have this discussion so we're not chasing a moving target the whole time we're trying to catch up with the remands.

LOWRY: Although the Hearings Board has called this an (inaudible) of process and as



the capital facilities planning gets finalized, that's going to have implication for where the lines are drawn on the map. So it may be that it's part of the remand we're also going to have to re-address where the urban growth boundaries are.

LEE: I wouldn't consider that a foregone conclusion. It could be that it means that we strategically adjust some levels-of-service in some areas and not throw out the plan.

LEIN: Any other questions of staff?

DELEISSEGUES: No. It just seems like depending on what kind of properties you bring into the urban growth area and like commercial or business park or some of the properties that have the potential at least to provide jobs and employment might be worth the expenditure for the additional capital facilities, whereas residential growth may be another issue entirely. So, you know, I think there's more than one element to just whether or not properties are added or not added into the area.

MOSS: Well, the basic problem seems to be the lack of money to fund one at all, not where to spend the money or where to set our priorities. It seems like a --

LEE: If you're looking for a head nod, yeah, I think realistically that's the issue that Clark County and most other governmental agencies are facing these days.

LOWRY: I hate agreeing with Mr. Karpinski --

LEIN: Too much.

LOWRY: -- too much, but I also need to agree with his conclusion that we haven't adequately -- I mean if the conclusion is that we need to lower level-of-service, we do need to look at what the environmental consequences of that will be and so that's going to make the analysis even more complex.

LEIN: So are you saying we're going to go through this again next year?

LOWRY: What you're going to go through next year will be a heck of a lot more technical and a heck of a lot more challenging I think than even coming up with the assumptions and drawing the lines on the map that was done this year.

LEIN: Thank you.

RUPLEY: Why did you say thank you?

DELEISSEGUES: As long as we're agreeing with Mr. Karpinski, I think he made another good point, you can only lower the level-of-service so far and then that doesn't become an option anymore. It seems like three of the alternatives out of three we heard

tonight had something to do with lowering the level-of-service.

DUST: There wasn't an option that staff presented to you that didn't involve lowering the level-of-service somewhere, and that's a natural result of having 600 and some million dollars worth of demand and only 537 or 36 million dollars worth of revenue. One thing that's interesting from the revenue perspective is that given the tax structure currently in the State of Washington for Counties and Cities, it doesn't look like there is any combination of land use that gets you enough revenue short of if you could build a city that was all retail and was relying on draining essentially tax dollars from a hinterland, that's it, because the property tax limitation of one percent, fine, you get that growth, you get the bump in the assessment, the first year it comes out on the books, then it gets whacked off with the one percent cap. And so while you are growing, all growth from a revenue perspective is a losing proposition.

DELEISSEGUES: It seems like GMA ought to be re-invented, then, because if the fastest growing county in Washington; i.e., Clark County, can't manage under the GMA to plan for growth that we know we're going to have whether we can afford it or not or if we don't grow at all we're going to push up the prices of existing homes; i.e., like Portland and, you know, then it will have unaffordability. So either way you're not making a more livable place, which I should think would be an objective of the GMA, and if we can't do it, I don't know how those smaller communities can do it or the larger cities can do it. Maybe they can, I don't know.

LEE: Well, they also aren't all on the state line where you have totally different tax structures that enter into the picture.

LOWRY: And I'm not sure this is a fatal flaw in GMA. What GMA is forcing us to do is face this issue at a planning stage rather than after the issue is surfaced through gridlock and the problem really isn't GMA so much as it is the funding mechanisms to build the necessary road infrastructure.

LEIN: Any other comments?

DELEISSEGUES: I think I'll let that one go, but I think we could argue that for a long time, you know, that if you can't afford the infrastructure, you can't grow, and if you can't grow, then you can't afford the infrastructure which is failing now according to Mr. Karpinski.

LEE: I mean there's various things you can do. One of the things that speaking of regional cooperation that METRO side did when they were faced with this was they went to a two hour peak which changes the dynamics somewhat. That is certainly a viable policy option. If we choose to go there through the capital facilities follow through, it may help mitigate some of the shortfalls that we're seeing. Now to the person driving on that same road it might not seem much different, from the

defensibility of the document it makes a significant difference.

RUPLEY: I can't even balance my checkbook.

MOSS: That's much in the same category as lowering the level-of-service, it's a --

LEE: But it's not as an open policy decision though.

MOSS: These are some really difficult questions that we're wrestling with here. And I certainly understand the revenue problem that we have, but we have to also keep in mind that the Draconian measures that we're looking at here to that might result from any policy decisions that are made are going to have a significant effect on the real economy of the county and, you know, we need to look at both of those. It strikes me that these aren't the best of times right now from an employment perspective and we're hoping that the economy is going to bounce back, and yet many of these decisions that we make can shape the economic future of this county too. Certainly freezing everything in place at this time is not a good way to help the economy, but if that's a consequence of GMA, then perhaps we need to speak to the legislature about changing GMA. And I'm not saying that GMA is a bad vehicle either, you know, I do think that we need to confront these issues, I just think we need to be careful about what the outcome is.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

None.

### **COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The hearing adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County

Planning Commission Minutes  
Thursday, October 23, 2003  
Page 36

Web Page at [www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP\\_PCagenda.asp](http://www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp)

---

Vaughn Lein, Chair

---

Date

*Minutes Transcribed By:*  
*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter*  
*Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant*

SW\min 10-23-2003